arXiv:1612.06491v1 [quant-ph] 20 Dec 2016

Tripartite-to-bipartite Entanglement Transformation by Stochastic Local Operations and Classical Communication and the Classification of Matrix Spaces

Yinan Li [1],* Youming Qiao[1],† Xin Wang[1],‡ and Runyao Duan[1,2]§
[1]*Centre for Quantum Software and Information, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Technology Sydney (UTS), NSW 2007, Australia and*
[2]*UTS-AMSS Joint Research Laboratory for Quantum Computation and Quantum Information Processing, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

We study the problem of transforming a tripartite state to a bipartite one using stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC). It is known that the one-shot tripartite-to-bipartite SLOCC convertibility is completely determined by the maximal Schmidt rank of the given tripartite state, i.e. the largest Schmidt rank of those bipartite states lying in the range of the reduced density operator. In this paper, we obtain results in tripartite-to-bipartite entanglement transformation, in both finite and asymptotic settings, by studying properties of the maximal Schmidt rank.

In the finite setting, we first show that the maximal Schmidt rank is super-multiplicative, i.e., the maximal Schmidt rank of two copies of a given state can be strictly larger than the square of its maximal Schmidt rank. We then provide a complete characterization of those tripartite states satisfying this property. Note that such tripartite states admit advantages in tripartite-to-bipartite SLOCC transformation when multiple copies are supplied.

In the asymptotic setting, we introduce the asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank of a tripartite state, which can be understood as the largest possible Schmidt rank one can obtain from a single copy of the given tripartite state under SLOCC, *asymptotically*. We first compute the asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank for a large family of tripartite states explicitly. Then, combined with certain powerful results from invariant theory, we exhibit a sufficient and necessary condition to determine whether a single copy of a given tripartite state can be transformed to the bipartite maximally entangled state under SLOCC, in this asymptotic setting. Thanks to the recent progress on the non-commutative rank problem, our condition can be verified in deterministic polynomial time.

I. INTRODUCTION

As an important concept in quantum mechanics, entanglement plays a central role in quantum information processing. It is the resource responsible for the quantum computational speed-up, quantum communication, quantum cryptography and so on. In the well-known bipartite case, there is no doubt that the bipartite maximally entangled state, or the *Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen* (EPR) state, plays an important role in quantum information theory, since it is usually sufficient to perform many quantum information processing tasks, such as quantum teleportation [1] and superdense coding [2]. Unfortunately, in practice, it becomes very difficult to preserve the bipartite pure entanglement as the two systems may interact with other systems (e.g. environment), thus changing the situation to the multipartite setting. Consequently, a very natural question to ask is, how many pure bipartite entangled states can be distilled from a multipartite state, by means of *local operations and classical communication* (LOCC)? In most circumstances, it is sufficient to consider the tripartite-to-bipartite entanglement transformation problem, if we consider some

* Yinan.Li@student.uts.edu.au
† Youming.Qiao@uts.edu.au
‡ Xin.Wang-8@student.uts.edu.au
§ Runyao.Duan@uts.edu.au

third party have access to all the other ancillary systems. In fact, this problem has been studied under the name of *Entanglement of Assistance* [3]. The Entanglement of Assistance is a property of 3-party states, and quantifies the maximal bipartite entanglement that can be distilled on average between two parties A and B, if party C measures his particle and communicates the result to A and B. This quantity has been well studied in an asymptotic setting [4], and has many applications including the study of environment-assisted capacity of quantum channel [5], the study of unital quantum channels, and the quantum Birkhoff's theorem [6].

A slightly different setting may be also taken into consideration. Roughly speaking, assume parties A, B and C share a tripartite state. Their goal is to recover some bipartite entangled state with the help of C, by means of *stochastic local operations and classical communication* (SLOCC). The physical meaning of SLOCC operations is that they can be implemented by LOCC with some nonzero probability. SLOCC has been used to study entanglement classification [7, 8] and entanglement transformation [9–11]. The advantage of using SLOCC over LOCC is that, SLOCC operations admit a better mathematical structure. Based on this, it is known that the SLOCC bipartite entanglement transformation can be characterized using *Schmidt rank* [12, 13]. That is, a bipartite state $|\phi\rangle$ can be transformed to another bipartite state $|\psi\rangle$ if and only if the Schmidt rank of $|\phi\rangle$ is no less than that of $|\psi\rangle$. For SLOCC tripartite entanglement transformations, it has been shown that the *tensor rank* of a tripartite state cannot be increased under SLOCC operations, providing an important entanglement monotone [9].

In these contexts, besides characterizing feasibility of transformations, another important perspective is to view such problems from the algorithmic viewpoint, asking whether there exists an efficient algorithm, which, given two states, decides one can be transformed to the other using SLOCC operations. This perspective can be made precise via the computational complexity theory. It is well-known that computing the Schmidt rank of a bipartite state (equivalent to computing the rank of matrices) admits a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm, which can be used to determine the bipartite SLOCC convertibility. On the other hand, computing the tensor rank of a tripartite state is NP-hard [14], and based on this, Chitambar et al. [9] shows that decideing the SLOCC convertibility for tripartite states in general is also NP-hard.

Similarly, the tripartite-to-bipartite SLOCC convertibility can be determined by the so called *maximal Schmidt rank*, denoted by $msrk(\cdot)$, which is the highest Schmidt rank over those bipartite states lying in the range of the reduced density operator $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{C}}(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}|)$ shared by A and B. It turns out that a tripartite state $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ can be transformed to a bipartite one $|\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$ if and only if the maximal Schmidt rank of $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ is no larger than the Schmidt rank of $|\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$ [15]. Similarly, we can also consider the complexity of deciding tripartite-to-bipartite SLOCC convertibility. It turns out that computing the maximal Schmidt rank of a tripartite state is equivalent to computing the rank of a matrix with entries being linear forms over $\mathbb{C}$ [16, 17], which admits a randomized polynomial-time algorithm [18].

More generally, it is natural to consider asymptotic SLOCC transformations, that is, transforming n copies of a given tripartite state to n copies of a target bipartite state by means of SLOCC, when n goes to infinity. One motivation to study asymptotic SLOCC transformations is to formally justify the interpretation of entanglement as a fungible resource for information processing. Therefore, it is natural to examine the largest Schmidt rank over those bipartite states that can be obtained from a given tripartite state by SLOCC, in an asymptotic setting. This quantity can be formalized using the following *asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank*, defined as

$$msrk^{\infty}(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) = \sup_{n\geq 1} \sqrt[n]{msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle^{\otimes n})}.$$

In fact, this idea can be applied to the bipartite to bipartite, and the tripartite to tripartite settings, to yield the definitions of the asymptotic Schmidt rank, and the asymptotic tensor ranks, respec-

tively. Interestingly, the asymptotic Schmidt rank of a bipartite state is equal to its Schmidt rank, since Schmidt rank is multiplicative, namely, for bipartite states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$, the Schmidt rank of $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle$ equals the product of the Schmidt ranks of $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$. On the other hand, it is known that the tensor rank is not multiplicative [9], which makes the asymptotic tensor rank notoriously difficult to evaluate.

In this paper, we study the tripartite-to-bipartite entanglement transformation by means of SLOCC, in both the finite-copy setting and the asymptotic setting. Our results are as follows.

In the finite-copy setting, we first show that the maximal Schmidt rank is super-multiplicative, by constructing a tripartite state $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ satisfying $msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle^{\otimes 2}) > msrk(|\psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle)^2$. Then we provide a characterization of super-multiplicative tripartite states. Note that such tripartite states admit more advantage in tripartite-to-bipartite SLOCC transformation with multiple copies.

In the asymptotic setting, we first provide an explicit formula for the asymptotic maximal Schmidt ranks of a large family of tripartite states of which the maximal Schmidt ranks are super-multiplicative. We then consider the problem of determining whether the $d \otimes d$ maximally entangled state $|\Phi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{0 \le i \le d-1} |i_{\mathrm{A}}\rangle |i_{\mathrm{B}}\rangle$ can be obtained from a given triparite state by SLOCC asymptotically. Based on the explicit formular, and certain results from invariant theory, we provide a full characterization of those states that can achieve so. Surprisingly, this characterization is actually algorithmically effective, that is, there exist deterministic polynomial-time algorithms to determine whether this condition holds for a given tripartite state [19, 20].

Organization. In Sect. II we present preliminaries about SLOCC transformations, and some background of invariant theory. In Sect. III, we construct tripartite states of which their maximal Schmidt rank are super-multiplicative, and provide a full characterization for those tripartite states satisfy this property. In Sect. IV, we explicitly compute the asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank of a large family of tripartite states and exhibit a sufficient and necessary result to determine whether a tripartite state can be transformed to the bipartite maximally entangled state by means of SLOCC, in an asymptotic setting. We close in Sect. V with a brief conclusion and discussion.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND BACKGROUNDS

A. Preliminaries

We use symbols such as $\mathcal{A}_d$, $\mathcal{B}_d$ and $\mathcal{C}_d$ to denote d-dimensional Hilbert spaces associated with parties A, B and C. For any bipartite pure state $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$, which is a unit vector in $\mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d$, $srk(|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle)$ denotes the Schmidt rank of $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$, which is the minimal number of product states required to linearly span $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$. Let $\rho^{\Phi}_{\mathrm{AB}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{C}}(|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \langle\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}|)$ be the reduced density operator shared by A and B of a tripartite state $|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$. The maximal Schmidt rank of a tripartite state $|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ is defined by

$$msrk(|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) = \max\{srk(|\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle : |\phi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle \in \mathrm{supp}(\rho^{\Phi}_{\mathrm{AB}})\}.$$

Then we can state how to use the concept of maximal Schmidt ranks to determine entanglement transformation from $|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$ to $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d$ by means of stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC):

Lemma 1 (Theorem 1 in Ref. [15]) *$|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ can be transformed to $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$ by means of SLOCC if and only if $msrk(|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) \ge srk(|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle)$.*

Now we turn to the asymptotic setting. A natural question to ask is, given tripartite state $|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$ and bipartite state $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d$, whether n copies of $|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ can be

transformed to $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$ by means of SLOCC, in the limit of large n. If so, we say $|\Phi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ can be transformed to $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$ by means of SLOCC, asymptotically. Given a tripartite state, it is important to determine which bipartite states can be obtained by means of SLOCC asymptotically. Inspired by Lemma 1, we define the so called *asymptotic maximal rank* to formalize this problem. Given a tripartite state $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$, its asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank is

$$msrk^{\infty}(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) = \sup_{n\geq 1} \sqrt[n]{msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle^{\otimes n})}.$$

This quantity characterizes the optimal Schmidt rank one can obtain from a single copy of $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ under SLOCC, in an asymptotic setting.

Clearly, computing the maximal and asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank are physically worthwhile. Although computing the Schmidt rank of a given bipartite state admits a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm [12], computing the maximal Schmidt rank of a given tripartite state only admits a randomized polynomial-time algorithm [18]. This is because computing the maximal Schmidt rank is equivalent to computing the rank of a matrix whose entries are linear forms [16, 17]. We briefly introduce how this equivalence works. Let the space of linear operators from $\mathcal{B}_d$ to $\mathcal{A}_d$ be $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_d, \mathcal{A}_d)$. The linear map $\mathrm{vec} : \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \to \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_d, \mathcal{A}_d)$ is defined by $\mathrm{vec}(|i\rangle\otimes|j\rangle) = |i\rangle\langle j|$, where $\{|i\rangle : i = 0, \ldots, d-1\}$ and $\{|j\rangle : j = 0, \ldots, d-1\}$ form an orthogonal basis of $\mathcal{A}_d$ and $\mathcal{B}_d$, respectively. This is a linear isomorphism between $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_d, \mathcal{A}_d)$ and $\mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d$. Given a bipartite state $|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle$, $\mathrm{vec}(|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle)$ is a linear operator in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}_d, \mathcal{A}_d)$, and we have

$$srk(|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle) = \mathrm{rank}(\mathrm{vec}(|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle)). \tag{1}$$

Similarly, for a tripartite pure state $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$, we define $M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})$ as follows:

$$M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}) = \mathrm{vec}[\mathrm{supp}(\rho^{\Psi}_{\mathrm{AB}})] = \mathrm{span}\{\mathrm{vec}(|\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle) : |\psi_{\mathrm{AB}}\rangle \in \mathrm{supp}(\rho^{\mathrm{AB}}_{\Psi})\}. \tag{2}$$

Notice that $M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})$ is a linear space of linear operators, or equivalently, it is a linear space of $d \times d$ matrices after fixing a set of basis of $\mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d$, and we call the latter a *matrix space*. By Eq. (1) and (2), computing the maximal Schmidt rank of the tripartite state $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ is equivalent to compute the largest rank over matrices in the matrix space $M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})$. The latter is known as the Edmonds' Problem in computation complexity theory [16, 17]. Utilizing the above equivalence, it is convenient to define the *maximal rank* and the *asymptotic maximal rank* of a $d \times d$ matrix space $\mathcal{S}$ as follows:

$$mrk(\mathcal{S}) = \max\{\mathrm{rank}(E) : E \in \mathcal{S}\}, \quad mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = \sup_{n\geq 1} \sqrt[n]{mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})}.$$

It is quite straightforward to see that, for $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$, we have

$$msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) = mrk(M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})), \quad msrk^{\infty}(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) = mrk^{\infty}(M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})).$$

In the above, we have reformulated the tripartite to bipartite SLOCC transformation problem, in both the one copy setting and the asymptotic setting, as certain problems about linear spaces of matrices. Therefore, we need to recall some basic properties of such spaces, More background knowledge will be covered in the next subsection. Let the space of all $m \times n$ matrices over complex field be $\mathcal{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{C})$ (we use $\mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$ to denote the space of all $d \times d$ matrices over complex field for short). A *matrix space* is a subspace of $\mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$, and is usually denoted by $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$. We say two matrix spaces $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$ are equivalent, if there exist invertible matrices $P, Q \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$, such that $\mathcal{S} = P\mathcal{S}'Q$. Analoguous to the image and kernel of matrices, we define the image and kernel of a matrix space $\mathcal{S}$ as $\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathrm{span}\{\cup_{E\in\mathcal{S}}\mathrm{Im}(E)\}$ and $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{S}) = \cap_{E\in\mathcal{S}}\mathrm{Ker}(E)$. A matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$ is *non-singular*, if it contains at least one full-rank matrix. Otherwise we say $\mathcal{S}$ is *singular*. One important structure for matrix spaces is the following so-called *shrunk subspaces*:

Definition 2 *Given* $\mathcal{S} = \mathrm{span}\{E_1, \ldots, E_m\} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$*, a subspace* $U \leq \mathbb{C}^d$ *is called a* shrunk subspace *of* $\mathcal{S}$*, if* $\dim(\mathcal{S}(U)) < \dim(U)$*, where* $\mathcal{S}(U) = \mathrm{span}\{\cup_{E\in\mathcal{S}}\{E\,|u\rangle : |u\rangle \in U\}\}$.

In fact, this definition is reminiscent of the *shrunk subset* as in the famous Hall's marriage theorem [21]. Recall that for a bipartite graph $G = (L \cup R, E)$ where $|L| = |R|$, Hall's marriage theorem states that G has a perfect matching if and only if G does not have a shrunk subset, that is a subset $S \subseteq L$ such that $|S| > |N(S)|$ where $N(S)$ denotes the set of neighbors of S. Getting back to the matrix space setting, it is clear that if $\mathcal{S}$ has shrunk subspaces, then $\mathcal{S}$ must be singular. However, unlike in the bipartite graph setting, it is not true that any singular matrix space has shrunk subspaces. For instance, the 3×3 skew symmetric matrix space $\mathrm{span}\{|i\rangle\langle j| - |j\rangle\langle i| : 0 \leq i < j \leq 2\} \leq \mathcal{M}(3)$ is singular, and has no shrunk subspace. We call those singular matrix spaces with shrunk subspaces *shrinking matrix spaces*, and those singular matrix spaces with no shrunk subspace *exceptional matrix spaces*.

Shrinking matrix spaces have a particular form when we transform them with appropriate bases changes. In the following, we present this form, generalize the definition of shrunk subspaces to $m \times n$ matrix spaces, and introduce an important family of shrinking matrix spaces, the *maximal compression matrix spaces*.

For a matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{C})$ with $m \leq n$, we say U is a shrunk subspace of $\mathcal{S}$ if $\dim(U) - \dim(\mathcal{S}(U)) > n - m$. Suppose $\dim(U) = n - q$ and $\dim(\mathcal{S}(U)) = p$. Fix bases for U and $\mathcal{S}(U)$ so that $U = \mathrm{span}\{|\alpha_{q+1}\rangle, \ldots, |\alpha_n\rangle\}$, and $\mathcal{S}(U) = \mathrm{span}\{|\beta_1\rangle, \ldots, |\beta_p\rangle\}$. Extend them to full bases of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $\mathbb{C}^m$ as follows: $\mathbb{C}^n = \mathrm{span}\{|\alpha_1\rangle, \ldots, |\alpha_q\rangle, |\alpha_{q+1}\rangle, \ldots, |\alpha_n\rangle\}$ and $\mathbb{C}^m = \mathrm{span}\{|\beta_1\rangle, \ldots, |\beta_p\rangle, |\beta_{p+1}\rangle, \ldots, |\beta_m\rangle\}$. Let P and Q be unitary matrices transforming the original bases to the above two bases, and let $\mathcal{S}' = P\mathcal{S}Q^{-1}$. It is easy to verify that every matrix E' in $\mathcal{S}'$ is of the following block form:

$$E' = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_{p\times q} & B_{p\times(n-q)} \\ \hline C_{(m-p)\times q} & D_{(m-p)\times(n-q)} \end{array}\right]_{m\times n},$$

where $A_{p\times q} \in \mathrm{span}\{|\beta_i\rangle\langle\alpha_j| : 1 \leq i \leq p,\ 1 \leq j \leq q\}$, $B_{p\times(n-q)} \in \mathrm{span}\{|\beta_i\rangle\langle\alpha_j| : 1 \leq i \leq p,\ q+1 \leq j \leq n\}$, $C_{(m-p)\times q} \in \mathrm{span}\{|\beta_i\rangle\langle\alpha_j| : p+1 \leq i \leq m,\ 1 \leq j \leq q\}$ and $D_{(m-p)\times(n-q)} \in \mathrm{span}\{|\beta_i\rangle\langle\alpha_j| : p+1 \leq i \leq m,\ q+1 \leq j \leq n\}$. Notice that $D_{(m-p)\times(n-q)} = \mathbf{0}_{(m-p)\times(n-q)}$ for any $E' \in \mathcal{S}'$, since any matrix $E \in \mathcal{S}$ maps U into a subspace of $\mathcal{S}(U)$. Therefore, we conclude that any matrix in some shrinking matrix space $\mathcal{S}$ in $\mathcal{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{C})$ can be represented in the following form:

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_{p\times q} & B_{p\times(n-q)} \\ \hline C_{(m-p)\times q} & \mathbf{0}_{(m-p)\times(n-q)} \end{array}\right]_{m\times n},$$

where p and q are positive integers which satisfy $p + q < m$ and can be determined by the matrix space $\mathcal{S}$.

Now, given a shrinking matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(m\times n, \mathbb{C})$, up to equivalence, it can be embedded into $\mathcal{A}(p, q, m, n) = \mathrm{span}\{\{|i\rangle\langle j| : 1 \leq i \leq p,\ 1 \leq j \leq n\} \cup \{|i\rangle\langle j| : p+1 \leq i \leq m,\ 1 \leq j \leq q\}\}$, where p, q, m, n are parameters determined by $\mathcal{S}$ (in general, they satisfy $p + q < m \leq n$). $\mathcal{A}(p, q, m, n)$ is called the *maximal compression matrix space* of parameters (p, q, m, n). When $m = n = d$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}(p, q, d)$ for short. Note that the maximal rank of $mrk(\mathcal{A}(p, q, m, n))$ is just $p + q$.

B. Results on shrunk subspaces

In this subsection we first review some mathematical results concerning shrunk subspaces. We then introduce recent progress on algorithms to decide the existence of shrunk subspaces.

Shrunk subspaces emerge in several mathematical areas. The first appearance of shrunk subspaces seems to be in T. G. Room's treatise on determinants in 1930's [22]. We mentioned in Section II A that shrunk subspaces can be viewed as a linear algebraic analogue of shrunk subsets as in the Hall's marriage theorem, which in turn is a basic result in combinatorics [23]. In matroid theory, Lovász observed that the intersection of two linear matroids naturally leads to shrunk subspaces [24].

Shrunk subspaces appear in non-commutative algebra as follows. Suppose $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$ is a matrix space over some field $\mathbb{F}$ and spanned by $\{T_1, \ldots, T_m\} \subset \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$. Let $\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ be a set of non-commuting variables, and form a matrix $T = x_1T_1 + \cdots x_mT_m$ whose entries are linear forms in x_i's. Matrices of this type has been studied in non-commutative algebra in the context of the free skew field since 1970's [25]. The rank of such a matrix over the free skew field, which was named *non-commutative rank* and denoted by $ncrk(\cdot)$, was shown to be the minimum r such that there exists a shrunk subspace $U \leq \mathbb{F}_d$ with $\dim(U) - \dim(\mathcal{S}(U)) = n - r$ [26].

Another way to reach the concept of shrunk subspaces is to consider matrix spaces with maximal ranks bounded from above [27]. Characterizing those matrix spaces is known to be a difficult problem; in fact, such matrix spaces basically correspond to certain torsion-free sheaves on projective spaces [27]. To make progress on this topic, one approach is to consider certain "witnesses" that can serve as an upper bound on the maximal rank. As mentioned, shrunk subspaces can be used as such witnesses. Specifically, if a matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d)$ has a shrunk subspace U with $\dim(U) - \dim(\mathcal{S}(U)) = c > 0$, then it is clear that $mrk(\mathcal{S}) \leq d - c$. On the other hand, an interesting result by Fortin and Reutenauer showed the following:

Theorem 3 (Corollary 2. in Ref. [26]) *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a matrix space in $\mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$. Then $mrk(\mathcal{S}) \leq ncrk(\mathcal{S}) \leq 2mrk(\mathcal{S})$.*

An important characterization of matrix spaces with shrunk subspaces comes from invariant theory. Consider the group action of $(A, C) \in \mathrm{SL}(d) \times \mathrm{SL}(d)$ on $\mathcal{M}(d)^{\oplus m}$ by sending $(B_1, \ldots, B_m)$ to $(AB_1C^T, \ldots, AB_mC^T)$. This induces an action on the ring of polynomial functions on $\mathcal{M}(d)^{\oplus m}$. Let $R(d, m)$ be the ring of those polynomials invariant under this action. $R(d, m)$ is called *the ring of matrix semi-invariants* (for matrices of size $d \times d$) [20, 28]. The common zeros of homogeneous polynomials of positive degrees in $R(d, m)$, denoted as $N(R(d, m))$, is referred to as the *nullcone* of this invariant ring in the invariant theory literature. The link to shrinking matrix spaces is the following result from invariant theory, proved using the celebrated Hilbert-Mumford criterion.

Theorem 4 ([29, 30]) *$(B_1, \ldots, B_m)$ is in $N(R(d, m))$ if and only if $\mathrm{span}(B_1, \ldots, B_m)$ has a shrunk subspace.*

Therefore, matrix spaces with shrunk subspaces are characterized by those polynomials in $R(d, m)$.

Invariant theory also helps to certify those matrix spaces with no shrunk subspaces. That is, given a matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$, if $\mathcal{S}$ does not have shrunk subspaces, we would like to present a short witness to certify this fact. For example, if $\mathcal{S}$ contains a full-rank matrix A, then exhibiting A is enough to certify that $\mathcal{S}$ does not contain shrunk subspaces. However, as mentioned, it is possible that a matrix space has neither full-rank matrices nor shrunk subspaces. To resolve this difficulty, we first recall what polynomials in $R(d, m)$ look like. This task is usually resolved in the so-called first fundamental theorem for $R(d, m)$.

Theorem 5 ([30–33]) *Every homogeneous polynomial in $R(d, m)$ is of degree kd for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and is a linear combination of polynomials of the form $\det(X_1 \otimes A_1 + \ldots X_m \otimes A_m)$ where X_i's are $d \times d$ variable matrices, and A_i's are $k \times k$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}$.*

Theorem 5 motivates the following definition. For a matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$, the kth *blow-up* of $\mathcal{S}$ is $\mathcal{S}^{[k]} = \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(dk, \mathbb{F})$. It is clear that, if $\mathcal{S}$ possesses a shrunk subspace, then $\mathcal{S}^{[k]}$ has a shrunk subspace for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{S} = \mathrm{span}(B_1, \ldots, B_m)$ does not possess a shrunk subspace, then it is not in the nullcone of $R(d, m)$ (Theorem 4). This implies that there exists some $(A_1, \ldots, A_m) \in \mathcal{M}(k)$ such that $\det(B_1 \otimes A_1 + \cdots + B_m \otimes A_m) \neq 0$ (Theorem 5), which just says that $\mathcal{S}^{[k]}$ contains a non-singular matrix. To see that k is finite is classical: by Hilbert's basis theorem, $N(R(d, m))$ can be defined by finitely many polynomials, therefore k is also finite. Recently, exciting progress suggests that k can be take to be no more than $d - 1$ as long as $|\mathbb{F}|$ is large enough ([28]; see also [34] for a simpler proof of $k \leq d+1$). Summarizing the above we have

Theorem 6 ([28, 34]) *If $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$ does not have a shrunk subspace, then for some $k \leq d + 1$, $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{M}(k, \mathbb{F})$ contains a full-rank matrix.*

The full-rank matrix as in Theorem 6 then serves as a short witness for $\mathcal{S}$ to have no shrunk subspaces.

We can also easily formulate an algorithmic problem around shrunk subspaces as follows.

Problem 7 *Given a matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$, decide whether $\mathcal{S}$ has a shrunk subspace $U \leq \mathbb{F}_d$.*

This problem is known as the non-commutative rank problem [26], the non-commutative rational identity testing problem [35], and the non-commutative Edmonds problem [36]. We adopt the non-commutative rank problem as in [26]. This name choice is due to the connection with the free skew field as mentioned above. Recent advances suggest that this problem can be solved deterministically in polynomial time.

Theorem 8 (Ref. [19, 20]) *There exists a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm to decide whether a given matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{F})$ has full non-commutative rank or not when $|\mathbb{F}|$ is large enough.*

III. MAXIMAL SCHMIDT RANK IS SUPER-MULTIPLICATIVE

In this section, we will show that maximal Schmidt rank is super-multiplicative. In general, we say a functional $f : \mathcal{A}_d \to \mathbb{C}$ is multiplicative, if for any $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d$, $f(|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle) = f(|\psi\rangle) f(|\phi\rangle)$. In asymptotic theory, these functions admit an important property, that is, $f(|\psi\rangle) = f^{\infty}(|\psi\rangle) = \sup_{n \geq 1} \sqrt[n]{f(|\psi\rangle^{\otimes n})}$. However, maximal Schmidt rank is not multiplicative, as shown by the following theorem:

Theorem 9 *Let d be an odd number and $|\Psi^d_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ be a tripartite state with $M(\Psi^d_{\mathrm{ABC}}) = \mathrm{span}\{|i\rangle\langle j| - |i\rangle\langle j| : 1 \leq i, j \leq d\}$, which is the $d \times d$ skew symmetric matrix space. We have*

$$msrk(|\Psi^d_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) = d - 1,\ msrk(|\Psi^d_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle^{\otimes 2}) = d^2 > (d-1)^2.$$

Proof It is known that for odd d, the $d \times d$ skew-symmetric matrix space is exceptional with maximal rank equal to $d - 1$. We now show $mrk(M(\Psi^d_{\mathrm{ABC}})) = d^2$. Specifically, letting $E_{ij} = |i\rangle\langle j| - |j\rangle\langle i| \in M(\Psi^d_{\mathrm{ABC}})$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq d$, we claim that

$$P = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} E_{ij} \otimes E_{ij}$$

has rank d^2. Notice that P is in the block matrix form:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E_{12} & \cdots & E_{1d} \\ -E_{12} & 0 & \cdots & E_{2d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -E_{1d} & -E_{2d} & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will prove that $\mathrm{Ker}(P) = \{0\}$. Let $|\alpha\rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} x_i(j) |ij\rangle$ and denote $|\alpha_i\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{d} x_i(j) |j\rangle$. Then for $2 \leq k \leq d-1$, we have:

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} E_{ik} |\alpha_i\rangle + \sum_{i=k+1}^{d} E_{ki} |\alpha_i\rangle = 0.$$

For $k = 1$, we have $\sum_{i=2}^{d} E_{1i} |\alpha_i\rangle = 0$ and for $k = d$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} E_{id} |\alpha_i\rangle = 0$. Notice that $E_{jk} |\alpha_i\rangle = x_i(j) |k\rangle - x_i(k) |j\rangle$, we can rewrite the equations to:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=2}^{d} (x_i(1) |i\rangle - x_i(i) |1\rangle) = 0, \quad k = 1 \\ -\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (x_i(k) |i\rangle - x_i(i) |k\rangle) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{d} (x_i(i) |k\rangle - x_i(k) |i\rangle) = 0, \quad k = 2, \ldots, d-1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (x_i(d) |i\rangle - x_i(i) |d\rangle) = 0, \quad k = d \end{aligned}$$

This will derive $x_i(j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq d$ and $m_k = \sum_{i \neq k} x_i(i) = 0$ for $k = 1, \ldots, d$. Notice that $m_k - m_{k+1} = x_{k+1}(k+1) - x_k(k) = 0$ for $k = 1, \ldots, d-1$ and $m_d - m_1 = x_1(1) - x_d(d) = 0$. We derive

$$x_k(k) = 0, \quad k = 1, \ldots, d.$$

Thus $|\alpha\rangle = 0$ is the only solution for $P |\alpha\rangle = 0$, hence $\mathrm{rank}(P) = d^2$. □

Theorem 9 suggests that $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}^d\rangle$ cannot be transformed to the $d \otimes d$ maximally entangled state by means of SLOCC, but can do so with two copies. In general, the maximal Schmidt rank of those tripartite states $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ satisfying $msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle^{\otimes 2}) > msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle)^2$ are said to be super-multiplicative. It is then natural to consider tripartite states whose maximal Schmidt rank are super-multiplicative, as these states can be used to obtain larger Schmidt rank when multiple copies are provided. Interestingly, these tripartite states can be characterized by the following theorem, based on the properties of their corresponding matrix spaces:

Theorem 10 *A tripartite state $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$ satisfies $msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle^{\otimes 2}) > msrk(|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle)^2$ if and only if $M(\psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}) \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$ satisfies:*

1. *$mrk(M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})) < \dim[\mathrm{Im}(M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})]$, and*
2. *$mrk(M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})) < d - \dim[\mathrm{Ker}(M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})]$,*

Proof We shall focus on the matrix space $\mathcal{S} = M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})$ and consider when $mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes 2}) > mrk(\mathcal{S})^2$. The following observation from Ref. [37] is useful to estimate the rank of linear combinations of two matrices:

Lemma 11 (Lemma 2.2 in Ref.[37]) *Given two matrices* $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$. *If* $Y\mathrm{Ker}(X) \not\leq \mathrm{Im}(X)$, *then* $\mathrm{rank}(X{+}rY) > \mathrm{rank}(X)$ *except for at most* $\mathrm{rank}(X)+1$ *elements* $r \in \mathbb{C}$.

We can use this lemma to prove the necessary part. Notice that a matrix space $\mathcal{S}$ satisfying the above two conditions must be singular. Choose $E \in \mathcal{S}$ with the highest rank, i.e. $\mathrm{rank}(E) = mrk(\mathcal{S}) < d$. Define the following two matrix spaces:

$$\mathcal{X} = \{F \in \mathcal{S} : \mathrm{Im}(F) \leq \mathrm{Im}(E)\}, \;\; \mathcal{Y} = \{F \in \mathcal{S} : \mathrm{Ker}(E) \leq \mathrm{Ker}(F)\}.$$

We claim that $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are two proper subspaces of $\mathcal{S}$. Otherwise, assuming $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{S}$, we have $mrk(\mathcal{S}) = \mathrm{rank}(E) = \dim(\mathrm{Im}(E)) = \dim(\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{S}))$, which is a contradiction. If $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{S}$, we have $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathrm{Ker}(E) = d - \mathrm{rank}(E) = d - mrk(\mathcal{S})$, which is also a contradiction. Now we can choose $E' \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $E' \notin X \cup Y$ and satisfies $\mathrm{Im}(E') \not\leq \mathrm{Im}(E)$ and $\mathrm{Ker}(E) \not\leq \mathrm{Ker}(E')$.

Then we claim that there exists $r \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathrm{rank}(E \otimes E + rE' \otimes E') > \mathrm{rank}(E \otimes E)$. Notice that $\mathrm{Ker}(E \otimes E) = \mathrm{span}\{\mathrm{Ker}(E) \otimes \mathbb{C}^d, \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathrm{Ker}(E)\}$ and $\mathrm{Im}(E \otimes E) = \mathrm{Im}(E) \otimes \mathrm{Im}(E)$. We are going to show $E' \otimes E'(\mathrm{Ker}(E) \otimes \mathbb{C}^d) \not\leq \mathrm{Im}(E) \otimes \mathrm{Im}(E)$. Then by Lemma 11, we can show $mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes 2}) > mrk(\mathcal{S})^2$.

Since E has the highest rank in $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathrm{rank}(E{+}rE') \leq \mathrm{rank}(E)$ for any $r \in \mathbb{C}$. Using Lemma 11 again, we see that $E'\mathrm{Ker}(E)$ is a subspace of $\mathrm{Im}(E)$. Since $\mathrm{Ker}(E) \not\leq \mathrm{Ker}(E')$, we can choose a non-zero vector $|v\rangle \in \mathrm{Ker}(E)$ such that $0 \neq E'|v\rangle \in \mathrm{Im}(E)$. Moreover, since $\mathrm{Im}(E') \not\leq \mathrm{Im}(E)$, we can find a vector $|u\rangle$ such that $0 \neq E'|u\rangle \notin \mathrm{Im}(E)$. Setting $|v\rangle \otimes |u\rangle \in \mathrm{Ker}(E) \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, we have $0 \neq E'|v\rangle \otimes E'|u\rangle \notin \mathrm{Im}(E) \otimes \mathrm{Im}(E)$. Thus there exist $r \in \mathbb{C}$ such that:

$$mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes 2}) \geq \mathrm{rank}(E \otimes E + rE' \otimes E') > \mathrm{rank}(E \otimes E) = mrk(\mathcal{S})^2.$$

For the sufficient part, we are going to prove that if $\mathcal{S}$ does not satisfy either one of those two conditions, $mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes 2}) = mrk(\mathcal{S})^2$. When $\mathcal{S}$ is non-singular, this equation always holds. Now given a singular matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$ satisfying $\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{S}) = \dim(\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{S}))$, we will show $mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes 2}) = mrk(\mathcal{S})^2$. And the other case is similar. Suppose $mrk(\mathcal{S}) = r < d$. Fix bases of $\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{S})$, say $\{v_1, \ldots, v_r\}$ and extend them to $\{v_1, \ldots, v_r, v_{r+1}, \ldots, v_d\}$ which is full bases of $\mathbb{C}^d$. For any matrix $F \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\mathrm{Im}(F) \leq \mathrm{span}\{v_1, \ldots, v_r\}$. Then any matrix $F \in \mathcal{S}$ can be expressed by this basis in the following form:

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} F_r \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix},$$

where F_r is a $r \times d$ matrix and the rest part of F are all zero. Thus we can derive $\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes 2}) \leq \mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{S})^2$ since any matrix in $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ will have at most r^2 non-zero rows. □

IV. COMPUTE THE ASYMPTOTIC MAXIMAL (SCHMIDT) RANK USING MATRIX SPACE STRUCTURE

We first provide an equivalent definition for the asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank of a tripartite states $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$ and the asymptotic maximal rank of a matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$:

Lemma 12

$$\begin{aligned} msrk^{\infty}(|\Psi^{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{msrk(|\Psi^{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle^{\otimes n})}, \\ mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Proof Let $c_n = \log_2 mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes n})$. By the lemma about the limit of a nonnegative sequence in Ref. [38], we only need to prove that $c_n \leq kn$ for some $k \geq 0$ and $c_m + c_n \leq c_{m+n}$. The first inequality is simple by choosing $k = d$ and the second one can be proved by the fact that $\text{rank}(A)\text{rank}(C) \leq \text{rank}(A \otimes C)$. □

Since we have known that $msrk(\cdot)$ (as well as $mrk(\cdot)$) is super-multiplicative. It is in general hard to compute the exact value. Here, guided by the structure of matrix spaces, we compute the asymptotic maximal rank explicitly for a large family of matrix spaces, as well as the asymptotic Schmidt rank of those corresponding tripartite states:

Theorem 13 *Given a matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$,*

1. *If $\mathcal{S}$ does not have shrunk subspaces, we have $\frac{1}{2}d^n \leq mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes n}) \leq d^n$. Thus $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = d$.*
2. *If $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{A}(p, q, d)$ satisfying $p+q < d$, $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = d\max\{2^{-D(1-\alpha||p')}, 2^{-D(\alpha||q')}\}$, where $p' = \frac{p}{d}$, $q' = \frac{q}{d}$, $\alpha = \frac{\log_2(d-q)-\log_2 p}{\log_2((d-p)(d-q))-\log_2(pq)}$ and $D(a||b) = a\log_2\frac{a}{b} + (1-a)\log_2\frac{1-a}{1-b}$.*

Proof of Theorem 13 (1). We first show the asymptotic maximal rank of matrix spaces without shrunk subspace is always with full rank. Clearly, if $\mathcal{S}$ is non-singular, it is easy to show $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = d$. In fact, the property of having no shrunk subspaces is stable under tensor product. To be specific, we have the following:

Lemma 14 *Given two matrix spaces $\mathcal{S}_1 \leq \mathcal{M}(d_1)$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 \leq \mathcal{M}(d_2)$ which have no shrunk subspace. Then $\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes \mathcal{S}_2 \leq \mathcal{M}(d_1 d_2)$ has no shrunk subspace.*

Proof Utilizing results in Ref. [19, 20] and theorem 6, we know that $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$ has no shrunk subspace if and only if $mrk(\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})) = d^2$. Now consider the matrix space $\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes \mathcal{S}_2 \otimes \mathcal{M}(d_1 d_2)$, which is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}(d_1) \otimes \mathcal{S}_2 \otimes \mathcal{M}(d_2)$. Since $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ have no shrunk subspace, we can find matrices $A_i \in \mathcal{S}_i \otimes \mathcal{M}(d_i)$ such that $\text{rank}(A_i) = d_i^2$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then we have $mrk(\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes \mathcal{S}_2 \otimes \mathcal{M}(d_1 d_2)) = \text{rank}(A_1 \otimes A_2) = d_1^2 d_2^2$. Thus $\mathcal{S}_1 \otimes \mathcal{S}_2$ cannot have shrunk subspaces. □

Now, for an exceptional matrix space $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$, if there is a finite integer N such that $\mathcal{S}^{\otimes N}$ is non-singular, then we have $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = d$. Otherwise, since $\mathcal{S}^{\otimes n}$ is exceptional for every integer n, by theorem 3, we have $\frac{1}{2}d^n = \frac{1}{2}ncrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes n}) \leq mrk(\mathcal{S}^{\otimes n}) \leq d^n$ for every n. This induces that $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = d$. □

Recall that to Theorem 13 (2) requires us to calculate the asymptotic maximal rank of the maximal compression matrix space. To start with, we explicitly compute the maximal rank of the tensor product of two maximal compression matrix spaces:

Lemma 15 *Given two maximal compression matrix spaces $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}(p_1, q_1, m_1, n_1)$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}(p_2, q_2, m_2, n_2)$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} mrk(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) =& p_1 p_2 + \min\{(n_1 - q_1)q_2, p_1(m_2 - p_2)\} \\ &+ \min\{(m_1 - p_1)p_2, q_1(n_2 - q_2)\} + q_1 q_2. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Proof We consider the block matrix form of $P \in \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & \cdots & A_{1q_1} & A_{1q_1+1} & \cdots & A_{1n_1} \\ \vdots & P_0 & \vdots & \vdots & P_1 & \vdots \\ A_{p_1 1} & \cdots & A_{p_1 q_1} & A_{p_1 q_1+1} & \cdots & A_{p_1 n_1} \\ A_{p_1+1 1} & \cdots & A_{p_1+1 q_1} & & & \\ \vdots & P_2 & \vdots & & \mathbf{0} & \\ A_{m_1 1} & \cdots & A_{m_1 q} & & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

In general, the block elements of first p_1 rows and q_1 columns are filled by the elements belong to $\mathcal{A}_2$. Denote the upper left block by P_0, the upper right block by P_1 and lower left block by P_2. We are going to show P_1 and P_2 belong to some maximal compression spaces, up to the equivalence.

Notice that P_1 is a $p_1m_2 \times (n_1-q_1)n_2$ matrix, we can move all columns with more than p_1p_2 elements to the left and move all rows with more than $(n_1-q_1)q_2$ elements to the top by multiplying with some invertible matrices. Moreover, we have

$$P_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1' = \mathcal{A}(p_1p_2, (n_1-q_1)q_2, p_1m_2, (n_1-q_1)n_2).$$

Similarly, we have

$$P_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2' = \mathcal{A}((m_1-p_1)p_2, q_1q_2, (m_1-p_1)m_2, q_1n_2).$$

Now we are going to show $mrk(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = mrk(\mathcal{A}_1') + mrk(\mathcal{A}_2')$, where

$$mrk(\mathcal{A}_1') = p_1p_2 + \min\{(n_1-q_1)q_2, p_1(m_2-p_2)\};$$

$$mrk(\mathcal{A}_2') = \min\{(m_1-p_1)p_2, q_1(n_2-q_2)\} + q_1q_2.$$

If $(n_1-q_1)q_2 \geq p_1(m_2-p_2)$, then $mrk(\mathcal{A}_1') = p_1m_2$, which is the maximal row rank of P_0. If $(m_1-p_1)p_2 \geq q_1(n_2-q_2)$, $mrk(\mathcal{A}_2') = q_1n_2$, which is the maximal column rank of P_0. We can use Gaussian elimination to eliminate P_0 and obtain the result. Now consider $(n_1-q_1)q_2 < p_1(m_2-p_2)$ and $(m_1-p_1)p_2 < q_1(n_2-q_2)$ hold simultaneously. In fact, notice that $mrk(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = mrk(\mathcal{A}_2 \otimes \mathcal{A}_1)$, we consider $\mathcal{A}_2 \otimes \mathcal{A}_1$ and it is easy to obtain $mrk(\mathcal{A}_2 \otimes \mathcal{A}_1) = m_1p_2 + n_1q_2 = mrk(\mathcal{A}_1') + mrk(\mathcal{A}_2')$. In conclusion, we have

$$mrk(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = p_1p_2 + \min\{(n_1-q_1)q_2, p_1(m_2-p_2)\} + \min\{(m_1-p_1)p_2, q_1(n_2-q_2)\} + q_1q_2.$$

□

Now let $\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}(p,q,m,n)$. We have the following:

Lemma 16 *For the maximal compression matrix space $\mathcal{A}(p,q,m,n)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,m,n)^{\otimes N+1}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \binom{N}{k} (&\min\{p^{N-k+1}(m-p)^k, q^k(n-q)^{N-k+1}\} \\ &+ \min\{q^{k+1}(n-q)^{N-k}, p^{N-k}(m-p)^{k+1}\}).\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Proof By substitute $\mathcal{A}_2$ to $\mathcal{A}_1$ itself in the proof of lemma 15, we can ignore the situation that $(n_1-q_1)q_2 < p_1(m_2-p_2)$ and $(m_1-p_1)p_2 < q_1(n_2-q_2)$ hold simultaneously. Thus we can always use Gaussian elimination and obtain off-diagonal block matrices belongs to $\mathcal{A}_1^{\otimes 2}$ (up to equivalence) with the form of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & P_1 \\ P_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,m,n)^{\otimes 2}) = &\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p^2, (n-q)q, pm, (n-q)n) \\ &+\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}((m-p)p, q^2, (m-p)m, qn)).\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Thus after $n+1$ times of tensor product, by some simple calculation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&mrk(\mathcal{A}(p,q,m,n)^{\otimes N+1}) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N} \binom{N}{k} mrk(\mathcal{A}(p^{N-k+1}(m-p)^k, q^{k+1}(n-q)^{N-k}, p^{N-k}(m-p)^k m, q^k(n-q)^{N-k}n)).\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Notice that for some k, $\mathcal{A}(p^{N-k+1}(m-p)^k, q^{k+1}(n-q)^{N-k}, p^{N-k}(m-p)^k m, q^k(n-q)^{N-k}n)$ may become non-singular. The following generalized formula can be used to calculate Eq. (5):

$$\begin{aligned} mrk(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = &\min\{p_1p_2, (n_1-q_1)(n_2-q_2)\} + \min\{(n_1-q_1)q_2, p_1(m_2-p_2)\} \\ &+ \min\{(m_1-p_1)p_2, q_1(n_2-q_2)\} + \min\{q_1q_2, (m_1-p_1)(m_2-p_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are ready to compute the asymptotic maximal rank for maximal compression matrix spaces:

Proof of Theorem 13 (2). Let $\lambda = \log_2 \frac{d-p}{q}$, $\mu = \log_2 \frac{d-q}{p}$, $\alpha = \frac{\mu}{\lambda+\mu}$. Then define $N_1 = \alpha N + \alpha - 1$ and $N_2 = \alpha N + \alpha$. We first expand equation (5) explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)^{\otimes(N+1)}) = &\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N_1 \rfloor} \binom{N}{k} (p^{N-k+1}(d-p)^k + p^{N-k}(d-p)^{k+1}) \\ &+ \sum_{k=\lceil N_1 \rceil}^{\lfloor N_2 \rfloor} \binom{N}{k} (p^{N-k+1}(d-p)^k + q^{k+1}(d-q)^{N-k}) \\ &+ \sum_{k=\lceil N_2 \rceil}^{N} \binom{N}{k} (q^k(d-q)^{N-k+1} + q^{k+1}(d-q)^{N-k}) \\ &= d\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N_2 \rfloor} \binom{N}{k} p^{N-k}(d-p)^k + d\sum_{k=\lceil N_1 \rceil}^{N} \binom{N}{k} q^k(d-q)^{N-k} \\ &- \sum_{k=\lceil N_1 \rceil}^{\lfloor N_2 \rfloor} \binom{N}{k} (p^{N-k}(d-p)^{k+1} + q^k(d-q)^{N-k+1}). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Let $p' = \frac{p}{d}$ and $q' = \frac{q}{d}$, we have $p' + q' < 1$. The above quantity is upper bounded by

$$\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)^{\otimes(N+1)}) \leq d^{N+1}(\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N_2 \rfloor} \binom{N}{k} p'^{N-k}(1-p')^k + \sum_{k=0}^{N-\lceil N_1 \rceil} \binom{N}{k} q'^{N-k}(1-q')^k).$$

We are going to use the following inequality introduced in Ref. [39]:

Lemma 17 *For $N_0 < Np_0$, we have:*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N_0} \binom{N}{k} p_0^k (1-p_0)^{N-k} \leq 2^{-ND(\frac{N_0}{N}||p_0)}, \tag{9}$$

where $D(a||b) = a\log_2 \frac{a}{b} + (1-a)\log_2 \frac{1-a}{1-b}$.

Choose a subsequence of $\sqrt[N]{\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)^{\otimes N})}$, where $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ satisfy $\lfloor \alpha(N+1) \rfloor \leq \alpha N \leq \lceil \alpha(N+1) \rceil$. To use the above inequality, we need to show $\lfloor N_2 \rfloor < N(1-p')$ and $N - \lceil N_1 \rceil < N(1-q')$. In fact, it is sufficient to prove $q' < \alpha < 1 - p'$. Substituting α by p' and q', we have

$$q' < \frac{\log_2 \frac{1-q'}{p'}}{\log_2 \frac{1-q'}{p'} + \log_2 \frac{1-p'}{q'}}, \quad 1-p' > \frac{\log_2 \frac{1-q'}{p'}}{\log_2 \frac{1-q'}{p'} + \log_2 \frac{1-p'}{q'}}. \tag{10}$$

Equivalently, we need to show:

$$(1-q')^{1-q'} q'^{q'} > p'^{1-q'}(1-p')^{q'}, \quad (1-p')^{1-p'} p'^{p'} > (1-q')^{q'} q'^{1-q'}. \tag{11}$$

Consider the functions $f(x,y) = x^y(1-x)^{1-y}$ with $x, y \in (0,1)$. The partial dirivation on x is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f(x,y) = \frac{x^{y-1}(y-x)}{(1-x)^y}.$$

For any fixed y, $\max_{x\in(0,1)} f(x,y) = f(y,y)$. And inequality (11) holds by choosing $x = p', y = q'$, $x = q', y = p'$.

Using lemma 17, we obtain

$$\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)^{\otimes(N+1)}) \leq d^{N+1}(2^{-ND(\frac{\lfloor N_2 \rfloor}{N}||1-p')} + 2^{-ND(1-\frac{\lceil N_1 \rceil}{N}||1-q')}). \tag{12}$$

Notice that $-D(a||p)$ is increasing for $0 < a < p$, we can obtain a better upper bound:

$$\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)^{\otimes(N+1)}) \leq d^{N+1}(2^{-ND(\alpha||1-p')} + 2^{-ND(1-\alpha+\frac{1}{N}||1-q')}). \tag{13}$$

Let n goes to infinity. Since L^p norm becomes L^∞ norm when $p \to +\infty$, we have

$$\mathrm{mrk}^\infty(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)) \leq d \max\{2^{-D(\alpha||1-p')}, 2^{-D(1-\alpha||1-q')}\}. \tag{14}$$

To obtain a lower bound for $\mathrm{mrk}^\infty(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d))$, we first derive the following from equality (8):

$$\mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)^{\otimes(N+1)}) \geq d^{N+1}(\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N_1 \rfloor} \binom{N}{k} p'^{N-k}(1-p')^k + \sum_{k=0}^{N-\lceil N_2 \rceil} \binom{N}{k} q'^{N-k}(1-q')^k).$$

We need to use the following lemma:

Lemma 18 (Theorem 11.1.3 in Ref. [40]) *if $Np_0 < N - N_0$, we have*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N_0} \binom{N}{k} (1-p_0)^k p_0^{N-k} \geq \frac{1}{(N+1)^2} 2^{-ND(\frac{N-N_0}{N}||1-p_0)}. \tag{15}$$

Notice that, by inequality (10), we have $p' < 1-\alpha$ and $q' < \alpha$. We can obtain $N - \lfloor N_1 \rfloor \geq (1-\alpha)N > p'N$ and $\lceil N_2 \rceil \geq \alpha N > q'N$ if $\alpha N \leq \lfloor \alpha(N+1) \rfloor \leq \lceil \alpha(N+1) \rceil \leq \alpha N + 1$. Then by lemma 18, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{mrk}(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)^{\otimes(N+1)}) &\geq \frac{d^{N+1}}{(N+1)^2}(2^{-ND(\frac{N-\lfloor N_1 \rfloor}{N}||p')} + 2^{-ND(\frac{\lceil N_2 \rceil}{N}||q')}) \\ &\geq \frac{d^{N+1}}{(N+1)^2}(2^{-ND(1-\alpha||p')} + 2^{-ND(\alpha||q')}). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The second inequality holds since $N - \lfloor N_1 \rfloor = N + 1 - \lfloor \alpha(N+1) \rfloor \geq (1-\alpha)N$ and $\lceil N_2 \rceil \geq \alpha N$. Thus we have

$$\mathrm{mrk}^\infty(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)) \geq d \max\{2^{-D(1-\alpha||p')}, 2^{-D(\alpha||q')}\}. \tag{17}$$

Since $D(a||b) = D(1-a||1-b)$. Combining inequalities 14 and 17, we have

$$\mathrm{mrk}^\infty(\mathcal{A}(p,q,d)) = d \max\{2^{-D(1-\alpha||p')}, 2^{-D(\alpha||q')}\}. \tag{18}$$

□

Consider the problem of whether a tripartite state can be transformed to the maximally entangled state by means of SLOCC, in an asymptotic setting. Theorem 13 immediately gives the following sufficient and necessary condition:

Corollary 19 *In an asymptotic setting, a single copy of $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$ can be transformed to the maximally entangled state in $\mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d$by means of SLOCC if and only if $M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}})$ does not have shrunk subspace.*

Proof Let $\mathcal{S} = M(\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}) \leq \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{C})$. It is equivalent to prove $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = d$ if and only if $\mathcal{S}$ does not have shrunk subspace.

For the necessary part, we have shown $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) = d$ if $\mathcal{S}$ has no shrunk subspace, by theorem 13.

For the sufficient part, we only need to prove that, any matrix space $\mathcal{S}$ which has shrunk subspaces will satisfy $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) < d$. Notice that every shrinking matrix space, up to equivalence, can be embedded into some maximal compression matrix space $\mathcal{A}(p, q, d)$ with parameter (p, q, d) satisfying $p + q < d$. By theorem 13, we know that

$$\mathrm{mrk}^{\infty}(\mathcal{A}(p, q, d)) = d \max\{2^{-D(1-\alpha||p')}, 2^{-D(\alpha||q')}\},$$

and $q' < \alpha < 1 - p'$. We can derive $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{A}(p, q, d)) < d$, which leads to $mrk^{\infty}(\mathcal{S}) < d$. □

It is worth noting that, the condition in theorem 8 is algorithmically effective. That is, there exist deterministic polynomial-time algorithm to determine whether a given matrix space has shrunk subspaces or not [19, 20]. In other words, we have

Corollary 20 *Given a tripartite state $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle \in \mathcal{A}_d \otimes \mathcal{B}_d \otimes \mathcal{C}_d$ as input, there exist deterministic polynomial-time algorithms to determine whether $|\Psi_{\mathrm{ABC}}\rangle$ can be transformed to the $d \otimes d$ maximally entangled state by means of SLOCC, in an asymptotic setting.*

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we study tripartite-to-bipartite SLOCC transformation, which is determined by the concept of maximal Schmidt rank[15]. Since computing maximal Schmidt rank is equivalent to computing the rank of a symbolic matrix [16, 18], it is natural to consider the properties of matrix spaces, which are linear spaces of matrices. We utilize the structure of matrix spaces, which has been studied in many field of mathematics including invariant theory and algebraic geometry, to study the properties of maximal Schmidt rank.

Our first result is to construct tripartite states of which the maximal Schmidt rank are super-multiplicative. This construction suggests that there exist tripartite states which cannot be transformed to the bipartite maximally entangled state by means of SLOCC with one single copy, but can do so with two copies. Moreover, we provide a full characterization for those tripartite states whose maximal Schmidt rank increases under tensor product. In fact, those tripartite states which admits this property have advantages in tripartite-to-bipartite SLOCC transformations with multiple copies.

In an asymptotic setting, we consider what kind of bipartite state can be obtained from some given tripartite state, by means of SLOCC, asymptotically. It is natural to introduce the concept of asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank to characterize this problem. However, it is in general difficult to analyse the behavior of non-multiplicative quantities. To get around this difficulty, firstly we explicitly compute the asymptotic maximal Schmidt rank for a large family of tripartite states of which the maximal Schmidt rank are super-multiplicative, by combining certain results from invariant theory. Then we are able to show that determining the asymptotic convertibility to the bipartite maximally entangled state is equivalent to determine whether a given matrix space has shrunk subspaces. The latter is also known as the non-commutative rank problem, introduced in Ref. [26]. By the recent progress on this problem [19, 20], our characterization has the advantage

of being algorithmically effective. That is, there exist deterministic polynomial-time algorithms to decide whether a tripartite state can be SLOCC transformed to the maximally entangled state asymptotically.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Andreas Winter for helpful discussions. RD's research was partly supported by the Australian Research Council (Grant Nos. DP120103776 and FT120100449). YQ's research was partly supported by Australian Research Council (Grant No. DE150100720).

[1] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, "Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 70, no. 13, p. 1895, 1993.

[2] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, "Communication via one-and two-particle operators on Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 69, no. 20, p. 2881, 1992.

[3] D. P. DiVincenzo, C. A. Fuchs, H. Mabuchi, J. A. Smolin, A. Thapliyal, and A. Uhlmann, *Entanglement of Assistance*, pp. 247–257. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.

[4] J. A. Smolin, F. Verstraete, and A. Winter, "Entanglement of assistance and multipartite state distillation," *Physical Review A*, vol. 72, no. 5, p. 52317, 2005.

[5] A. Winter, "On environment-assisted capacities of quantum channels," *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0507045*, 2005.

[6] C. B. Mendl and M. M. Wolf, "Unital quantum channels – convex structure and revivals of birkhoff's theorem," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 289, no. 3, pp. 1057–1086, 2009.

[7] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, "Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 62, p. 062314, Nov 2000.

[8] G. Gour and N. R. Wallach, "Classification of multipartite entanglement of all finite dimensionality," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 111, p. 060502, Aug 2013.

[9] E. Chitambar, R. Duan, and Y. Shi, "Tripartite entanglement transformations and tensor rank," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 101, no. 14, p. 140502, 2008.

[10] N. Yu, E. Chitambar, C. Guo, and R. Duan, "Tensor rank of the tripartite state ," *Physical Review A*, vol. 81, no. 1, p. 14301, 2010.

[11] L. Chen, E. Chitambar, R. Duan, Z. Ji, and A. Winter, "Tensor rank and stochastic entanglement catalysis for multipartite pure states," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 105, p. 200501, Nov 2010.

[12] G. Vidal, "Entanglement of Pure States for a Single Copy," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 83, no. 5, pp. 1046–1049, 1999.

[13] H.-K. Lo and S. Popescu, "Concentrating entanglement by local actions: Beyond mean values," *Physical Review A*, vol. 63, no. 2, p. 022301, 2001.

[14] J. Håstad, "Tensor rank is np-complete," *Journal of Algorithms*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 644 – 654, 1990.

[15] E. Chitambar, R. Duan, and Y. Shi, "Multipartite-to-bipartite entanglement transformations and polynomial identity testing," *Physical Review A*, vol. 81, no. 5, p. 52310, 2010.

[16] J. Edmonds, "Systems of distinct representatives and linear algebra," *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B*, vol. 71, pp. 241–245, 1967.

[17] L. Gurvits, "Classical complexity and quantum entanglement," *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, vol. 69, pp. 448–484, Nov. 2004.

[18] L. Lovász, "On determinants, matchings, and random algorithms.," in *FCT*, vol. 79, pp. 565–574, 1979.

[19] A. Garg, L. Gurvits, R. Oliveira, and A. Wigderson, "A deterministic polynomial time algorithm for non-commutative rational identity testing," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03730*, 2015.

[20] G. Ivanyos, Y. Qiao, and K. V. Subrahmanyam, "Constructive noncommutative rank computation in deterministic polynomial time over fields of arbitrary characteristics," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03531*, 2015.

[21] P. Hall, "On representatives of subsets," *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. s1-10, no. 1, pp. 26–30, 1935.
[22] T. G. Room, *The Geometry of Determinantal Loci*. The Cambridge University Press, 1938.
[23] L. Lovász and M. Plummer, *Matching Theory*. North-Holland Mathematics Studies, Elsevier Science, 1986.
[24] L. Lovász, "Singular spaces of matrices and their application in combinatorics," *Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática-Bulletin/Brazilian Mathematical Society*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 87–99, 1989.
[25] P. M. Cohn, "The word problem for free fields: A correction and an addendum," *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. 23, pp. 193–213, 1971.
[26] M. Fortin and C. Reutenauer, "Commutative/noncommutative rank of linear matrices and subspaces of matrices of low rank," *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire*, vol. 52, p. B52f, 2004.
[27] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, "Vector spaces of matrices of low rank," *Advances in Mathematics*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 135–155, 1988.
[28] H. Derksen and V. Makam, "Polynomial degree bounds for matrix semi-invariants." preprint ArXiv:1512.03393, 2015.
[29] M. Bürgin and J. Draisma, "The Hilbert null-cone on tuples of matrices and bilinear forms," *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol. 254, no. 4, pp. 785–809, 2006.
[30] B. Adsul, S. Nayak, and K. V. Subrahmanyam, "A geometric approach to the Kronecker problem II: rectangular shapes, invariants of matrices and the Artin–Procesi theorem." preprint, 2007.
[31] H. Derksen and J. Weyman, "Semi-invariants of quivers and saturation for littlewood-richardson coefficients," *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 467–479, 2000.
[32] A. Schofield and M. Van den Bergh, "Semi-invariants of quivers for arbitrary dimension vectors," *Indagationes Mathematicae*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 125–138, 2001.
[33] M. Domokos and A. N. Zubkov, "Semi-invariants of quivers as determinants," *Transformation groups*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 9–24, 2001.
[34] G. Ivanyos, Y. Qiao, and K. V. Subrahmanyam, "On generating the ring of matrix semi-invariants," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1508.01554, 2015.
[35] P. Hrubeš and A. Wigderson, "Non-commutative arithmetic circuits with division," *Theory of Computing*, vol. 11, no. 14, pp. 357–393, 2015.
[36] G. Ivanyos, Y. Qiao, and K. V. Subrahmanyam, "Non-commutative Edmonds' problem and matrix semi-invariants." Preprint arXiv:1508.00690. To appear in Computational Complexity, 2015.
[37] G. Ivanyos, M. Karpinski, and N. Saxena, "Deterministic polynomial time algorithms for matrix completion problems," *SIAM journal on computing*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 3736–3751, 2010.
[38] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen, and B. Schumacher, "Information transmission through a noisy quantum channel," *Physical Review A*, vol. 57, no. 6, p. 4153, 1998.
[39] R. Arratia and L. Gordon, "Tutorial on large deviations for the binomial distribution," *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 125–131, 1989.
[40] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.